arXiv:math/0211385v3 [math.LO] 9 Feb 2005

PRESERVING NON-NULL WITH SUSLIN$^+$ FORCINGS

JAKOB KELLNER

A   . We introduce the notion of effective Axiom A and use it to show that some popular tree forcings are Suslin$^+$. We introduce transitive nep and present a simplified version of Shelah's "preserving a little implies preserving much": If I is a Suslin ccc ideal (e.g. Lebesgue-null or meager) and P is a transitive nep forcing (e.g. P is Suslin$^+$) and P doesn't make any I-positive *Borel* set small, then P doesn't make *any* I-positive set small.

1. I

Properness is a central notion for countable support iterations: If a forcing P is proper then it is "well behaved" in certain respects (most notably P doesn't collapse ω_1); and properness is preserved under countable support iterations. Properness can be defined by the requirement that the generic filter (over V) is generic for a countable elementary submodel N as well (see 2.1).

It turns out that it can be useful to require genericity for non-elementary models M as well.[1] The first notion of this kind was Suslin proper [6], with the important special case Suslin ccc. This notion was generalized to Suslin$^+$ [4]. In this paper we recall these definitions, and introduce an effective version of Axiom A as a tool to show that all the usual Axiom A forcings are in fact Suslin$^+$.

In [13] Shelah introduced a further generalization: non-elementary proper (nep) forcing. Here, the models M considered are not only non-elementary but also non-transitive. This allows to deal with long forcing-iterations (which can never be element of a transitive countable model), but this also brings some unpleasant technical difficulties. To avoid some of these difficulties [13] uses a set theory with ordinals as urelements.

In this paper we define a special case, the "transitive version", of nep. In this version we consider transitive candidates only, which makes the whole setting much easier.

As an example of how to apply non-elementary properness we give a simplified proof of Shelah's "preserving a little implies preserving much" [13, sec. 7]: If a forcing P is provably nep and provably doesn't make the set of all old reals Lebesgue null, then P doesn't make any positive set null. The proof uses the fact that we can find generic conditions for models of the form $N[G]$, where N is (a transitive collapse of) an elementary submodel and G an *internal* N-generic filter (i.e. $G \in V$).

Date: December 2002.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 03E40, 03E17.

Partially supported by FWF grant P17627-N12. I thank a referee for pointing out an error and several unclarities.

[1] For this to make sense the forcing notion P has to be definable, otherwise we do not know how to find P in M, and therefore cannot formulate that G is P-generic over M.

The proof works in fact not only for the ideal of Lebesgue null sets, but for all Suslin ccc ideals (e.g. the meager ideal). A couple of theorems of this kind lead up to the general case in [13]: For the meager case the result is due to Goldstern and Shelah [12, Lem XVIII.3.11, p.920], the Lebesgue null case in the special case of P=Laver was done by Pawlikowski [10] (building on [7]). The definition and basic properties of Suslin ccc ideals have been used for a long time, for example in works of Judah, Bartoszyński and Rosłanowski, cited in [2]; also related is [14, §31].

The result is useful for positivity preservation in limit-steps of countable support proper iterations $(P_\alpha)_{\alpha<\delta}$: while it is not clear how one could argue directly that P_δ still is Borel positivity preserving, the equivalent "preservation of generics" (see definition 4.2) has a better chance of being iterable. In section [12, XVIII.3.10] this iterability is claimed for I=meager. For I=Lebesgue null the result will appear in [9].

Annotated contents.

Section 2, p. 2: We will recall the definition and basic properties of Suslin proper, Suslin ccc and Suslin$^+$ forcings, and introduce the notions transitive nep and effective Axiom A. We use effective Axiom A to show that Laver, Sacks and similar tree forcings are Suslin$^+$.

Section 3, p. 9: We introduce Suslin ccc ideals an their basic properties. Such ideals are defined by a Suslin ccc forcing Q with a name for a generic real $\underset{\sim}{\eta}$ in the same way as Lebesgue null can be defined from random forcing or meager from Cohen forcing.

Section 4, p. 11: We prove Shelah's "preserving a little implies preserving much" for transitive nep forcings.

2. S $^+$

A Note on Normal ZFC*. Let us recall the definition of properness:

Definition 2.1. P is proper if for some large regular cardinal χ, for all $p \in P$ and all countable elementary submodels $N \prec H(\chi)$ containing p and P there is a $q \leq p$ which is N-generic.

Intuitively, one would like to use elementary submodels of the universe instead of $H(\chi)$, but for obvious reasons this is not possible. So one has to show that the properness notion does not depend on the particular χ used in the definition, and that essential forcing constructions are absolute between V and $H(\chi)$ (and $V[G]$ and $H^{V[G]}(\chi)$). So while the choice of χ is not important, it is not a good idea to fix a specific χ (say, $\beth_\omega^+$), since we might for example want to apply the properness notion to forcings larger than this specific χ.

In Suslin forcing, instead of countable elementary submodels arbitrary countable transitive models of some theory ZFC*, so-called candidates, are used. Intuitively one would like to use ZFC, but this cannot be done for similar reasons. (For example, ZFC does not prove the existence of a ZFC-model.)

Again, it turns out that the choice of ZFC* is of no real importance (provided it is somewhat reasonable), but we should not fix a specific ZFC*.[2]

---

[2] We will sometimes require that every ZFC*-candidate M thinks that there is a ZFC**-candidate M' (and this fails for ZFC** = ZFC*), or that any forcing extension $M[G]$ of M satisfies ZFC**.

Definition 2.2.
- ZFC$^-$ denotes ZFC minus the powerset axiom plus "$\beth_\omega$ exists".
- An $\in$-theory ZFC* is called normal if $H(\chi) \vDash$ ZFC* for large regular χ.
- A recursive theory ZFC* is strongly normal if ZFC proves

$$\exists \chi_0\, \forall (\chi > \chi_0 \text{ regular })H(\chi) \vDash \mathrm{ZFC}^*.$$

We will be interested in strongly normal theories only. Clearly, ZFC$^-$ is strongly normal. Also, if T is strongly normal, then the theory T plus "there is a T-candidate" is strongly normal, and a finite union of strongly normal theories is strongly normal.[3]

The importance of normality is the following: If ZFC* is normal, then forcings that are non-elementary proper with respect to ZFC* are proper (see the remark after 2.3). However, normal doesn't necessarily mean "reasonable". For example, if in V there is no inaccessible, then ZFC$^-$ plus the negation of the powerset axiom is normal.

As usual, we will (without further mentioning) assume that certain (finitely many) strongly normal sentences are in ZFC*. For example, we will state that Borel-relations are absolute between candidates and V, which of course assumes that ZFC* contains enough of ZFC$^-$ to guarantee this absoluteness.

Candidates, Suslin and Suslin$^+$ forcing. The following basic setting will apply to all versions of Suslin forcings used in this paper (Suslin proper, Suslin ccc, Suslin$^+$) as well as transitive nep:

We assume that the forcing Q is defined by formulas $\varphi_{\in Q}(x)$ and $\varphi_{\leq}(x,y)$, using a real parameter r_Q. Fix a normal ZFC*. M is called a "candidate" if it is a countable transitive ZFC* model and $r_Q \in M$. We denote the evaluation of $\varphi_{\in Q}$ and $\varphi_{\leq}$ in a candidate M by Q^M and $\leq^M$.

We further assume that in every candidate Q^M is a set and $\leq^M$ a partial order on this set; and that $\varphi_{\in Q}$ and $\varphi_{\leq}$ are upwards absolute between candidates and V.[4]

A $q \in Q$ is called M-generic (or: Q-generic over M), if $q \Vdash$ "$G_Q \cap Q^M$ is Q^M-generic over M".

Usually (but not necessarily) it will be the case that $p \perp q$ is absolute between M and V. In this case q is M-generic iff $q \Vdash D \cap G_Q \neq \emptyset$ for all $D \in M$ such that $M \vDash$ "$D \subseteq Q$ dense". If $p \perp q$ is not absolute, then this is not enough, since it does not guarantee that $G_Q \cap Q^M$ is a filter on Q^M, i.e. that it does not contain elements p, q such that $M \vDash$ "$p \perp q$". In this case, "q is M-generic" is equivalent to:

$$q \Vdash |A \cap G_Q| = 1 \text{ for all } A \in M \text{ such that } M \vDash \text{“}A \subseteq Q \text{ is a maximal antichain”}.$$

We will only be interested in the case $Q \subseteq H(\aleph_1)$. Assume χ is regular and sufficiently large, and $N \prec H(\chi)$ is countable. Let $i : N \to M$ be the transitive collapse of N. Then $i \restriction Q$ is the identity, and M is a candidate. If Q is proper, then for every $p \in Q^M$ there is an M-generic $q \leq p$.

Sometimes it would be useful to have generic conditions for other candidates (that are not transitive collapses of elementary submodels). The first notion of this kind was Suslin proper:

---

[3] This is not true for countable unions, of course: By reflection, for every finite $T \subset$ ZFC, Con(T) is strongly normal, but ZFC cannot prove $H(\chi) \vDash$ Con(ZFC).

[4] This means that if M_1 and M_2 are candidates such that $M_1 \in M_2$, and if $q \leq^{M_2} p$, then $q \leq^{M_1} p$ and $q \leq^V p$.

Definition 2.3. A (definition of a) forcing Q is Suslin (or: strongly Suslin) in the parameter $r_Q \in \mathbb{R}$, if:

(1) r_Q codes three $\underset{\sim}{\Sigma}^1_1$ relations, $R^{\in}_Q$, $R^{\leq}_Q$ and $R^{\perp}_Q$.
(2) $R^{\leq}_Q$ is a partial order on $Q = \{x \in \omega^\omega : R^{\in}_Q(x)\}$ and $p \perp_Q q$ iff $R^{\perp}_Q(p, q)$.

Q is Suslin proper with respect to some normal ZFC*, if in addition:

(3) for every candidate M and every $p \in Q^M$ there is an M-generic $q \leq p$.

Remarks:

- A forcing Q (as a partial order) is called Suslin (proper), if there is a definition of Q which is Suslin (proper).
- "r_Q codes a Suslin forcing" is a $\underset{\sim}{\Pi}^1_2$ property. So if Q is Suslin in V, then Q is Suslin in all candidates and all forcing extension of V as well. In particular, in every candidate M, $\leq^M$ is a partial order on the set Q^M and $p \perp q$ is equivalent to $R^{\perp}_Q(p, q)$".
  However, the formula "$(\in_Q, \leq_Q, r_Q, \mathrm{ZFC}^*)$ codes a Suslin proper forcing" is a $\underset{\sim}{\Pi}^1_3$ statement and in general not absolute.
- If Q is Suslin, then $\perp$ is a Borel relation, and therefore the statement
  $$\{q_i : i \in \omega\} \text{ is predense below } p$$
  (i.e. $p \Vdash G \cap \{q_i : i \in \omega\} \neq \emptyset$) is $\underset{\sim}{\Pi}^1_1$ (i.e. relatively $\underset{\sim}{\Pi}^1_1$ in the $\underset{\sim}{\Sigma}^1_1$ set $Q^{(\omega+1)}$).
- If Q is Suslin proper with respect to ZFC*, and ZFC** is stronger than ZFC*, then Q is Suslin proper with respect to ZFC** as well.
- If Q is Suslin proper, then Q is proper.
  (As mentioned already, the transitive collapse M of a countable $N \prec H(\chi)$ is a candidate, Q is not changed by the collapse, and $q \leq p$ is M-generic iff $q \leq p$ is N-generic.)
- The definition of Suslin proper forcing could be applied to non-normal $\{\in\}$ theories ZFC* as well. This could be useful in other context, but not for this paper. Obviously such a forcing Q need not be proper any more. As an extreme example, ZFC* could contain "$0 = 1$". Then (3) is immaterial, since there are no candidates, and every forcing definition Q satisfying (1) and (2) is Suslin proper.

In [6] it is proven that if a forcing Q is Suslin and ccc (in short: Suslin ccc), then Q is Suslin proper in a very absolute way:

Lemma 2.4. "Q is Suslin ccc" is a $\underset{\sim}{\Pi}^1_2$ statement. So in particular, if Q is Suslin ccc, then

(1) Q is Suslin ccc in every candidate M and in every forcing extension of V.
(2) Q is Suslin proper: even 1_Q is generic for every candidate.

The proof proceeds as follows: Assume Q is Suslin. Using the completeness theorem $\varphi^{\mathrm{Keisler}}$ for the logic $L_{\omega_1\omega}(Q)$ (see [8]) it can be shown [6, 3.14] that "Q is ccc" is a Borel statement. (This requires that $\varphi^{\mathrm{Keisler}} \in \mathrm{ZFC}^*$, which we can assume since $\varphi^{\mathrm{Keisler}}$ is strongly normal.) So if M is a candidate and $M \vDash$ "$A \subseteq Q$ is a maximal antichain", then $M \vDash$ "A is countable". And we have already seen that for Q Suslin and A countable, the statement "A is predense" is $\underset{\sim}{\Pi}^1_1$ (and therefore absolute). So A is predense in V, and 1_Q forces that G_Q meets A.

Note that (1) and (2) of the lemma are trivially true for a Q that is definable without parameters (e.g. Cohen, random, amoeba, Hechler), assuming that ZFC $\vdash$ Q is ccc and ZFC* $\vdash$ Q is ccc.

For further reference, we repeat a specific instance of the last lemma here:

Lemma 2.5. If Q is Suslin ccc, $M_1 \subseteq M_2$ are candidates, and G is Q-generic over M_2 or over V, then G is Q-generic over M_1.

Cohen, random, Hechler and amoeba forcing are Suslin ccc and Mathias forcing is Suslin proper. Miller and Sacks forcing, however, are not, since incompatibility is not Borel.

This motivated a generalization of Suslin proper, Suslin$^+$ [4, p. 357]: here, we do not require $\perp$ to be $\undertilde{\Sigma}^1_1$, so "$\{q_i : i \in \omega\}$ is predense below p" will generally not be $\undertilde{\Pi}^1_1$ any more, just $\undertilde{\Pi}^1_2$. However, we require that there is a $\undertilde{\Sigma}^1_2$ relation epd ("effectively predense") that holds for "enough" predense sequences:

Definition 2.6. A (definition of a) forcing Q is Suslin$^+$ in the parameter r_Q with respect to ZFC*, if:

1. r_Q codes two $\undertilde{\Sigma}^1_1$ relations, $R^{\in}_Q$ and $R^{\leq}_Q$, and an $(\omega+1)$-place $\undertilde{\Sigma}^1_2$ relation epd.
2. In V and every candidate M, $\leq$ is a partial order on Q, and epd(q_i, p) implies "$\{q_i : i \in \omega\}$ is predense below p".
3. for every candidate M and every $p \in Q^M$ there is a $q \leq p$ such that every dense subset $D \in M$ of Q^M has an enumeration $\{d_i : i \in \omega\}$ such that epd(d_i, q) holds.

Again, a partial order Q is called Suslin$^+$ if it has a suitable definition.

Clearly, every Suslin proper forcing is Suslin$^+$: epd can just be defined by "$\{q_i : i \in \omega\}$ is predense below p", which is even a conjunction of $\undertilde{\Pi}^1_1$ and $\undertilde{\Sigma}^1_1$, and then the condition 2.6(3) is just a reformulation of 2.3(3).

Effective Axiom A. The usual tree-like forcings are Suslin$^+$. Here, we consider the following forcings consisting of trees on $\omega^{<\omega}$ ordered by $\subseteq$. (Usually, Sacks is defined on $2^{<\omega}$, but this is equivalent by a simple density argument.) For $s, t \in \omega^{<\omega}$ we write $s \leq t$ for "s is an initial segment of t"; for a tree $T \subseteq \omega^{<\omega}$ $s \leq_T t$ means $s \leq t$ and $s, t \in T$; and $s^\frown n$ is the immediate successor of s with last element n.

- Sacks, perfect trees: $(\forall s \in T)\ (\exists t \geq_T s)\ (\exists^{\geq 2} n)\ t^\frown n \in T$.
- Miller, superperfect trees: every node has either exactly one or infinitely many immediate successors, and $(\forall s \in T)\ (\exists t \geq_T s)\ (\exists^\infty n)\ t^\frown n \in T$.
- Rosłanowski: every node has either exactly one or all possible successors, and $(\forall s \in T)\ (\exists t \geq_T s)\ (\forall n \in \omega)\ t^\frown n \in T$.
- Laver: let s be the stem of T. Then $(\forall t \geq_T s)\ (\exists^\infty n)\ t^\frown n \in T$.

In the following, we call Sacks, Miller and Rosłanowski "Miller-like". Clearly, "$p \in Q$" and "$q \leq p$" are Borel (but $p \perp q$ is not).[5]

For Sacks, there is a proof of the Suslin$^+$ property in [4] and [5] using games. However, in the same way as the "canonical" proof of properness of these forcings uses Axiom A, the most transparent way to prove Suslin$^+$ uses an effective version of Axiom A:

---

[5] Alternatively, Q could of course be defined as the set of trees just *containing* a corresponding set, then $x \in Q$ is $\undertilde{\Sigma}^1_1$, and for the Miller-like forcings two compatible elements p, q have a canonical lower bound, $p \cap q$.

Baumgartner's Axiom A [3] for a forcing $(Q, \leq)$ can be formulated as follows: There are relations $\leq_n$ such that

1. $\leq_{n+1} \subseteq \leq_n \subseteq \leq$.
2. Fusion: if $(a_n)_{n\in\omega}$ is a sequence of elements of Q such that $a_{n+1} \leq_n a_n$ then there is an a_ω such that $a_\omega \leq a_n$ for all n.
3. If $p \in Q$, $n \in \omega$ and $D \subseteq Q$ is dense then there is a $q \leq_n p$ and a countable subset B of D which is predense under q.

Remarks:

- Actually, this is a weak version of Axiom A, usually something like $a_\omega \leq_n a_n$ will hold in (2).
- It is easy to see that in (3), instead of "and $D \subseteq Q$ is dense" we can equivalently use "and $D \subseteq Q$ is open dense" (or maximal antichain).

Now for "effective Axiom A" it is required that the $B \subseteq D$ in (3) is *effectively* predense below q, not just predense. Then Suslin$^+$ follows. To be more exact:

Definition 2.7. Q satisfies effective Axiom A (in the parameter r_Q with respect to ZFC*), if

1. r_Q codes $\utilde{\Sigma}^1_1$ relations, $R^{\in}_Q$, $R^{\leq}_Q$, and $\utilde{\Sigma}^1_2$ relations $\leq^n_Q$ $(n \in \omega)$ and an $(\omega + 1)$-place $\utilde{\Sigma}^1_2$ relation epd.
2. In V and every candidate M, $\leq$ is a partial order on Q and $\text{epd}(q_i, p)$ implies that $\{q_i : i \in \omega\}$ is predense below p.
3. Fusion: For all $(a_n)_{n\in\omega}$ such that $a_{n+1} \leq_n a_n$ there is an a_ω such that $a_\omega \leq a_n$.
4. In all candidates, if $p \in Q$, $n \in \omega$ and $D \subseteq Q$ is dense then there is a $q \leq_n p$ and a sequence $(b_i)_{i\in\omega}$ of elements of D such that $\text{epd}(b_i, q)$ holds.

Again, a partial order Q satisfies effective Axiom A if it has a suitable definition.

Lemma 2.8. If the partial order Q satisfies effective Axiom A, then Q is Suslin$^+$.

Proof. First we define $\text{epd}'(p'_i, q')$ by

$$(\exists q \geq q')\, (\exists \{p_i\} \subseteq \{p'_i\})\ \text{epd}(p_i, q).$$

Clearly, this is a $\utilde{\Sigma}^1_2$ relation coded by r_Q satisfying 2.6(2). Let M be a candidate, and let $\{D_i : i \in \omega\}$ list the dense sets of Q^M that are in M. Pick an arbitrary $a_0 = p \in Q^M$. We have to find a $q \leq p$ satisfying 2.6(3) with respect to epd$'$. Assume we have already constructed a_n. In M, according to (4) using D_n as D, we find an $a_{n+1} \leq_n a_n$ and $\{b^n_i : i \in \omega\} \subseteq D_n$ such that $\text{epd}(b^n_i, a_{n+1})$ holds (in M and therefore by absoluteness in V). In V pick $q = a_\omega$ according to (3). $\square$

The usual proofs that the forcings defined above satisfy Axiom A also show that they satisfy the effective version. To be more explicit: Let Q be one of the forcings. We define (for $p, q \in Q$, $n \in \omega$):

- $\text{split}(p) = \{s \in p : (\exists^{\geq 2} n \in \omega)\ s^\frown n \in p\}$.
- $\text{split}(p, n) = \{s \in \text{split}(p) : (\exists^{=n} t \leq s)\, t \in \text{split}(p)\}$.
(So $s \in \text{split}(p, n)$ means that s is the n-th splitting node along the branch $\{t \leq s\}$. In particular, $\text{split}(p, 0)$ is the singleton containing the stem of p.)
- $q \leq_n p$, if $q \leq p$ and $\text{split}(q, n) = \text{split}(p, n)$.
(So $q \leq_0 p$ if $q \leq p$ and q has the same stem as p.)

- For $s \in p$, $p^{[s]} = \{t \in p : t \leq s \vee s \leq t\}$.
- $F \subseteq p$ is a front (or: F is a front in p), if it is an antichain meeting every branch of p.
- $\mathrm{epd}(q_i, p)$ is defined by: There is a front $F \subseteq p$ such that $\forall t \in F\, \exists i \in \omega : q_i = p^{[t]}$.
- For Miller-like forcings, effectively predense could also be defined as $\mathrm{epd}'(q_i, p) \;:\leftrightarrow\; \exists n\, \forall s \in \mathrm{split}(p, n)\, \exists i : q_i = p^{[s]}$.

Clearly, $\mathrm{split}(p)$, $\mathrm{split}(p, n)$, $p^{[s]}$ and epd' are Borel, "F is a front" is $\underset{\sim}{\Pi}^1_1$, therefore epd is $\underset{\sim}{\Sigma}^1_2$. The following facts are easy to check ($p, q \in Q$):

- If $s \in p$, then $p^{[s]} \in Q$.
- If $F \subset p$ is a front and $q \parallel p$, then $q \parallel p^{[s]}$ for some $s \in F$.
- $\mathrm{split}(p, n)$ is a front in p.
- For $(q_n)_{n\in\omega}$ such that $q_{n+1} \leq_n q_n$, there is a canonical limit $q_\omega \in Q$ and $q_\omega \leq_n q_n$.
- If Q is Miller-like, and if $F \subset p$ is a front, and $\forall s \in F, p_s \in Q$, $p_s \subseteq p^{[s]}$, then $\bigcup_{s\in F} p_s \in Q$, and $\bigcup_{s\in F} p_s \subseteq p$.
- If Q is Laver, and if $F \subset p$ is a front, and $\forall s \in F, p_s \in Q$ has stem s, then $\bigcup_{s\in F} p_s \in Q$, and $\bigcup_{s\in F} p_s \subseteq p$.

$\leq_n$ and epd defined as above satisfy the requirements 2.7 for effective Axiom A:
(1)–(3) are clear.
For Miller-like forcings, (4) is proven as follows: Assume $D \subseteq Q$ is dense and $p \in Q$. For all $s \in \mathrm{split}(p, n + 1)$, $p^{[s]} \in Q$, so there is a $q^s \subseteq p^{[s]}$ such that $q^s \in D$. Now set $q := \bigcup_{s\in F} q^s \in Q$. Then $q \leq_n p$, and the set $\{q^s : s \in F\} \subseteq D$ is effectively predense below q according to the definition of epd' (or epd).
For Laver, we have to define a rank of nodes: Assume D is dense, and p_0 a condition with stem s_0, $s \geq s_0$, and $s \in p_0$. We define $\mathrm{rk}_D(p_0, s)$ as follows:

If there is a $q \subseteq p_0$ such that $q \in D$ and q has stem s, then $\mathrm{rk}_D(p_0, s) = 0$.
Otherwise $\mathrm{rk}_D(p_0, s)$ is the minimal α such that for infinitely many immediate successors t of s the following holds: $t \in p_0$ and $\mathrm{rk}_D(p_0, t) < \alpha$.

rk_D is well-defined for all nodes $\geq s_o$ in p_0:
Assume towards a contradiction that $\mathrm{rk}_D(p_0, s)$ is undefined. Then

$$q := \{s' \in p_0^{[s]} : s' \leq s \text{ or } \mathrm{rk}_D(p_0, s') \text{ undefined}\}$$

is a Laver condition stronger than p_0. Pick a $q' \leq q$ such that $q' \in D$. Let s' be the stem of q'. Then $\mathrm{rk}_D(p, s') = 0$, $s' \geq s$ and $s' \in q$, a contradiction.
Now define $q' \leq p_0$ inductively. First add all $s \leq s_0$ to q'. Assume $s \in q'$ and $s \geq s_0$. Then we add infinitely many immediate successors $t \in p_0$ of s to q'. If $\mathrm{rk}_D(p, s) \neq 0$, we additionally require that $\mathrm{rk}_D(p, t) < \mathrm{rk}_D(p, s)$ for each of these t (this is possible by the definition of $\mathrm{rk}_D(p, s)$). So the q' constructed this way is a Laver condition with the same stem s_0 as p_0. Also, along every branch of q', $\mathrm{rk}_D(p, s)$ is strictly decreasing (until it gets 0), therefore there is a front F_0 in q' such that for all $s \in F_0$, $\mathrm{rk}_D(p, s) = 0$. That means that for all $s \in F_0$ there is a $q^s \leq p_0$ such that $q^s \in D$ and q^s has stem s. Define q_0 to be $\bigcup_{s\in F_0} q^s$. Clearly $q_0 \leq p_0$, q_0 has the same stem s_0 as p_0, F_0 is a front in q_0 and for every $s \in F_0$, $q_0^{[s]} \in D$.
Given a Laver condition p and $n \in \omega$, define for every $p_0 \in \mathrm{split}(p, n)$ a q_0 as above, and let q be the union of these q_0, and F the union of the according F_0. Then $q \leq_n p$, and for every s in the front $F \subset q$, $q^{[s]} \in D$. This finishes the proof of effective Axiom A for Laver.

It is clear that the same proof of effective Axiom A works for other tree forcings as well, for example for all finite-splitting lim-sup tree forcings. (In [11, 1.3.5] such forcings are called $\mathbb{Q}_0^{\text{tree}}$.)

Transitive nep. So we have seen that Suslin ccc implies Suslin proper, which implies Suslin$^+$. For the proof of the main theorem 4.4, even less than Suslin$^+$ is required:[6] A forcing definition Q (using the parameter r_Q) is transitive nep (non-elementary proper), if

- "$p \in Q$" and "$q \leq p$" are upwards absolute between candidates and V.
- In V and all candidates, $Q \subseteq H(\aleph_1)$ and "$p \in Q$" and "$q \leq p$" are absolute between the universe and $H(\chi)$ (for large regular χ).
- For all candidates M and $p \in Q^M$ there is a $q \leq p$ forcing that $G \cap Q^M$ is Q^M-generic over M.

Recall our initial consideration: In proper forcing, we get the properness condition for (collapses of) elementary submodels only, but we would like to have it for non-elementary models as well. (This is the reason for the name "non-elementary proper".) So transitive nep captures this consideration with little additional assumptions.

There is also a (technically more complicated) version of nep for non-elementary and non-transitive candidates, defined in [13], which makes it possible for long iterations to be nep (transitive nep requires $Q \subseteq H(\aleph_1)$). The main theorem 4.4 of this paper holds for this general notion of nep as well (with nearly the same proof).

For every countable transitive model, $M \vDash$ "$p \Vdash \varphi(\tau)$" iff for all M-generic G containing p, $M[G] \vDash$ "$\varphi(\tau[G])$". If Q is nep and M a candidate, then $M \vDash$ "$p \Vdash \varphi(\tau)$" iff for all M- *and* V-generic G containing p, $M[G] \vDash$ "$\varphi(\tau[G])$":
One direction is clear. For the other, assume $M \vDash$ "$p' \leq p,\ p' \Vdash \neg\varphi(\tau)$". Let $q \leq p'$ be M generic. Then for any V-generic G containing q, G is M-generic as well and $M[G] \vDash$ "$\neg\varphi(\tau[G])$".

We will need the following instance of Shoenfield-Levy absoluteness:

Lemma 2.9. Let $x \in H(\aleph_1)$. Then "there is a candidate M containing x such that $M \vDash \varphi(x)$" is $\underset{\sim}{\Sigma}^1_2$ (and therefore absolute between universes with the same ω_1).

All in all we get the following implications:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\text{Suslin ccc} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \text{Suslin proper} \arrow[d] & & \\
\text{effective Axiom A} \arrow[r] & \text{Suslin}^+ \arrow[r] & \text{transitive nep} \arrow[r] & \text{proper}
\end{tikzcd}$$

---

[6] Actually, for the main theorem even less than nep would be sufficient: we need generic conditions for candidates M that are internal set forcing extensions of transitive collapses of elementary submodels only (not for all candidates). However, this restriction doesn't seem to lead to a natural nep notion.

3. S

The set of Borel codes (or Borel definitions) will be denoted by “BC”. So BC is a set of reals. For $A \in \mathrm{BC}$ we denote the set of reals that satisfy the definition A (in the universe V) with A^V.

If $Q \subseteq H(\aleph_1)$ is ccc, then a name $\underset{\sim}{\tau}$ for an element of ω^ω can be transformed into an equivalent hereditarily countable name $\underset{\sim}{\eta}$: for every n, pick a maximal antichain A_n deciding $\underset{\sim}{\tau}(n)$, then $\underset{\sim}{\eta} := \{(p,(n,m)) :\ p \in A_n, p \Vdash \underset{\sim}{\tau}(n) = m\}$ is equivalent to $\underset{\sim}{\tau}$.

From now on, we will assume the following:

Assumption 3.1. Q is a Suslin ccc forcing, $\underset{\sim}{\eta}$ is a hereditarily countable name coded by r_Q, $\Vdash_Q \underset{\sim}{\eta} \in \omega^\omega \setminus V$, and in all candidates: $\{[\![\underset{\sim}{\eta}(n) = m]\!] :\ n, m \in \omega\}$ generates $\mathrm{ro}(Q)$.

“X generates $\mathrm{ro}(Q)$” means that there is no proper sub-Boolean-algebra $B \supseteq X$ of $\mathrm{ro}(Q)$ such that $\sup_{\mathrm{ro}(Q)}(Y) \in B$ for all $Y \subseteq B$.

Lemma 3.2. This assumption is a $\underset{\sim}{\Pi}^1_2$ statement.

Proof. “Q is Suslin ccc” is $\underset{\sim}{\Pi}^1_2$ according to 2.4. For $x \in H(\aleph_1)$, a statement of the form “every candidate thinks $\varphi(x)$” is $\underset{\sim}{\Pi}^1_2$ (cf. 2.9). $\Vdash_Q$ ($\underset{\sim}{\eta} \in \omega^\omega \setminus V$) holds in V iff it holds in every candidate: If $M \vDash p \Vdash \underset{\sim}{\eta} = r$, then this holds in V as well: For Suslin ccc forcings, every V-generic filter is M-generic, and $\underset{\sim}{\eta} = r$ is absolute. The other direction follows from normality. $\square$

Lemma 3.3. For $A \in \mathrm{BC}$, “$q \Vdash \underset{\sim}{\eta} \in A^{V[G_Q]}$” is $\underset{\sim}{\Delta}^1_2$.

Remark: [1, 2.7] gives a general result for $\underset{\sim}{\Sigma}^1_n$ formulas.

Proof. For any candidate M containing q and A, “$q \Vdash \underset{\sim}{\eta} \in A$” is absolute between V and M: If $q \in G$ is V-generic, then it is M-generic as well (since Q is Suslin ccc), and $\underset{\sim}{\eta}[G] \in A$ is absolute between $M[G]$ and $V[G]$.

So $q \Vdash \underset{\sim}{\eta} \in A$ iff for all candidates M, $M \vDash q \Vdash \underset{\sim}{\eta} \in A$ (a $\underset{\sim}{\Pi}^1_2$ statement) iff for some candidate M: $M \vDash q \Vdash \underset{\sim}{\eta} \in A$ (a $\underset{\sim}{\Sigma}^1_2$ statement). $\square$

Lemma 3.4. The statement

$$\{[\![\underset{\sim}{\eta}(n) = m]\!] :\ n, m \in \omega\} \text{ generates } \mathrm{ro}(Q)$$

holds in M iff the following holds (in V):

if $G_1, G_2 \in V$ are Q-generic over M and $G_1 \cap M \neq G_2 \cap M$, then $\underset{\sim}{\eta}[G_1] \neq \underset{\sim}{\eta}[G_2]$.

Proof. If $\{[\![\underset{\sim}{\eta}(n) = m]\!] :\ n, m \in \omega\}$ generates $\mathrm{ro}(Q)$, then $G \cap Q^M$ can be calculated (in $M[G]$) from $\underset{\sim}{\eta}[G]$. On the other hand, let (in M) $B = \mathrm{ro}(Q)$, C the proper complete subalgebra generated by $[\![\underset{\sim}{\eta}(n) = m]\!]$. Take $b_0 \in B$ such that no $b' \leq b_0$ is in C, and set

$$c = \inf\{c' \in C :\ c' \geq b_0\}, \quad b_1 = c \setminus b_0.$$

So for all $c' \in C$, $c' \parallel b_0$ iff $c' \parallel b_1$. Let G_0 be B-generic over M such that b_0 in G. Then $H = G_0 \cap C$ is C-generic. In $M[H]$, $b_1 \in B/H$. So there is a $G_1 \supset H$ containing b_1. $\square$

Definition 3.5. The Suslin ccc ideal corresponding to $(Q, \underset{\sim}{\eta})$:

- $I_{\mathrm{BC}} = \{A \in \mathrm{BC} : \Vdash_Q \underset{\sim}{\eta} \notin A^{V[G_Q]}\}$.
- $I = \{X \subseteq \omega^\omega :\ \exists A \in I_{\mathrm{BC}} :\ A^V \supseteq X\}$.
- $X \in I^+$ (or: X is positive) means $X \notin I$, and X is of measure 1 means $\omega^\omega \setminus X \in I$. $I^+_{\mathrm{BC}} := \mathrm{BC} \setminus I_{\mathrm{BC}}$.

Note that we use the phrases “of measure 1”, “null” and “positive” for all Suslin ccc ideals, not just for the Lebesgue null ideal. For example, if $\mathbb{C}$ is Cohen forcing, then the null sets are the meager sets, and a set has “measure 1” if it is co-meager.

Clearly $A \in I_{\mathrm{BC}}$ iff $A^V \in I$.

An immediate consequence of lemma 3.3 is

Corollary 3.6. For $A \in \mathrm{BC}$, “$A \in I_{\mathrm{BC}}$” is $\underset{\sim}{\Delta}^1_2$.

So for Borel sets, being null is absolute.

Lemma 3.7. *I is a σ-complete ccc ideal containing all singletons, and there is a surjective σ-Boolean-algebra homomorphism $\phi : \mathrm{Borel} \rightarrow \mathrm{ro}(Q)$ with kernel I, i.e. $\mathrm{ro}(Q)$ is isomorphic to Borel/I as a complete Boolean algebra.*

ccc means: there is no uncountable family $\{A_i\}$ such that $A_i \in I^+$ and $A_i \cap A_j \in I$ for $i \neq j$ (or equivalently: $A_i \cap A_j = \emptyset$).

Proof. σ-complete is clear: If $X_i \subseteq A_i \in I$, and $\Vdash \underset{\sim}{\eta} \notin A_i$ for all $i \in \omega$, then $\Vdash \underset{\sim}{\eta} \notin \bigcup A_i \supseteq \bigcup X_i$.
For $A \in \mathrm{BC}$, define $\phi(A) = [\![\underset{\sim}{\eta} \in A^{V[G]}]\!]_{\mathrm{ro}(Q)}$. Then $\phi(\omega^\omega \setminus A) = \neg\phi(A)$, $\phi(\bigcup A_i) = \sup\{\phi(A_i)\}$, and if $A \subseteq B$, then $\phi(A) \leq \phi(B)$. If $\phi(A) \leq \phi(B)$, then $\Vdash \underset{\sim}{\eta} \notin (A \setminus B)$, so $A \setminus B \in I$. Since $\underset{\sim}{\eta}$ generates $\mathrm{ro}(Q)$ (in all candidates, and therefore in V as well by normality) and since Q is ccc, $\mathrm{ro}(Q) = \phi''\mathrm{Borel}$. So $\phi : \mathrm{Borel} \rightarrow \mathrm{ro}(Q)$ is a surjective σ-Boolean-algebra homomorphism. The kernel is the σ-closed ideal I, so Borel/I is isomorphic to $\mathrm{ro}(Q)$ as a σ-Boolean-algebra, and (since $\mathrm{ro}(Q)$ is ccc), even as complete Boolean algebra. □

Definition 3.8. η^* is called generic over M ($\eta^* \in \mathrm{Gen}(M)$), if there is an M-generic $G \in V$ such that $\underset{\sim}{\eta}[G] = \eta^*$.

According to 3.4, this G is unique (on $Q \cap M$). For example, if Q is random, then $\mathrm{Gen}(M)$ is the set of random reals over M.

$[\![\underset{\sim}{\eta} \in B]\!] = q$ is equivalent to

$$q \Vdash \underset{\sim}{\eta} \in B \text{ and if } p \perp q \text{ then } p \Vdash \underset{\sim}{\eta} \notin B,$$

which is $\underset{\sim}{\Pi}^1_2$ (because of lemma 3.3 and the fact that $p \perp q$ is Borel). For $q \in Q$ we denote a B such that $[\![\underset{\sim}{\eta} \in B]\!] = q$ by B_q. Of course B_q is not unique, just unique modulo I. $q \Vdash \underset{\sim}{\eta} \in A$ iff $\Vdash (\underset{\sim}{\eta} \in B_q \rightarrow \underset{\sim}{\eta} \in A)$, i.e. iff $\Vdash \underset{\sim}{\eta} \notin B_q \setminus A$. So we get $q \Vdash \underset{\sim}{\eta} \notin A$ iff $A \cap B_q \in I$, and $q \Vdash \underset{\sim}{\eta} \in A$ iff $B_q \setminus A \in I$.

If M is a candidate, then because of lemma 3.2 the assumption 3.1 holds in M, so M knows about the isomorphism $\mathrm{ro}(Q) \rightarrow \mathrm{Borel}/I$ and in M there is a B^M_q as above.

Lemma 3.9. *Let M be a candidate and $q \in Q \cap M$. Then*

1. $\mathrm{Gen}(M) = \omega^\omega \setminus \bigcup\{A^V : A \in I_{\mathrm{BC}} \cap M\}$.
2. $\{\underset{\sim}{\eta}[G] : G \in V \text{ is } M\text{-generic and } q \in G\} =$
   $= \omega^\omega \setminus \bigcup\{A^V : A \in \mathrm{BC} \cap M, q \Vdash \underset{\sim}{\eta} \notin A^{V[G_Q]}\} = \mathrm{Gen}(M) \cap B^M_q$.
3. $\mathrm{Gen}(M)$ is a Borel set of measure 1.

For example, if Q is random forcing, this just says that η^* is generic (i.e. random) over M iff for all Borel codes $A \in M$ of null sets, $\eta^* \notin A^V$.

Proof. (1) is just a special case of (2).

(2) Set

$$\begin{aligned} X &:= \omega^\omega \setminus \bigcup\{A^V : A \in \mathrm{BC} \cap M, q \Vdash \underset{\sim}{\eta} \notin A^{V[G_Q]}\}, \text{ and} \\ Y &:= \{\underset{\sim}{\eta}[G] : G \in V \text{ is } M\text{-generic and } q \in G\}. \end{aligned}$$

Assume $\eta^* \in Y$. Let G be M-generic such that $q \in G$ and $\underset{\sim}{\eta}[G] = \eta^*$. If $M \vDash q \Vdash \underset{\sim}{\eta} \notin A^{V[G_Q]}$, then $M[G] \vDash \eta^* \notin A^{M[G]}$, i.e. $\eta^* \notin A^V$. So $\eta^* \in X$.

If $\eta^* \in X$, use (in M) the mapping ϕ : Borel $\to$ ro(Q) ($A \mapsto [\![\underset{\sim}{\eta} \in A]\!]$). If $\phi(A) \leq \phi(B)$, then $\Vdash \underset{\sim}{\eta} \notin (A \setminus B)$, so by our assumption, $\eta^* \notin (A \setminus B)$. Given $\underset{\sim}{\eta}^*$, define G by $\phi(A) \in G$ iff $\eta^* \in A$. G is well defined: If $\eta^* \in A \setminus B$, then $\phi(A) \neq \phi(B)$. We have to show that G is a generic filter over M: If $\phi(A_1), \phi(A_2) \in G$, then $\eta^* \in A_1 \cap A_2$, so $\phi(A_1) \wedge \phi(A_2) \in G$. If $\phi(A) \leq \phi(B)$, then $\eta^* \notin (A \setminus B)$, so $\phi(A) \in G \to \phi(B) \in G$. Since $\phi(\emptyset) = 0$, and $\eta^* \notin \emptyset$, $0 \notin G$. If $\sup(\phi(A_i)) \in G$, $(A_i) \in M$, then $\eta^* \in \bigcup A_i$, i.e. for some i, $\phi(A_i) \in G$. Since $q \Vdash \underset{\sim}{\eta} \notin \omega^\omega \setminus B^M_q$, $\eta^* \notin \omega^\omega \setminus B^M_q$, i.e. $\eta^* \in B^M_q$, and since $\phi(B^M_q) = q$, $q \in G$, so $\eta^* \in Y$. So we have seen that $Y = X \subseteq \mathrm{Gen}(M) \cap B^M_q$.

If $\eta^* \in \mathrm{Gen}(M) \cap B^M_q$, witnessed by G, then $\underset{\sim}{\eta}[G] \in B^M_q$, so $q \in G$ (since $q = [\![\underset{\sim}{\eta} \in B^M_q]\!]$), i.e. $\eta^* \in Y$.

(3) follows from 1, since I is σ-complete. □

Note that if Q is not ccc, then our definition of I does not lead to anything useful. For example, if Q is Sacks forcing, then I_Q is the ideal of countable sets, and clearly lemma 3.9 does not hold any more. There are a few possible definitions for ideals generated by non-ccc forcings, see for example [2]. For tree-forcings Q, a popular ideal is the following: A set of reals X is in I, if for every $T \in Q$ there is a $S \leq_Q T$ such that $\lim(S) \cap X = \emptyset$. In the case of Sacks forcing this ideal is called Marczewski ideal, it is not ccc, and a Borel set A is in I iff A is countable.

4. P

Definition 4.1.
- P is Borel I^+-preserving, if for all $A \in I^+_{\mathrm{BC}}$, $\Vdash_P A^V \in I^+$.
- P is I^+-preserving, if for all $X \in I^+$, $\Vdash_P \check{X} \in I^+$.

For example, if Q=random, then random forcing is I^+-preserving, and Cohen forcing is not Borel I^+-preserving. If Q=Cohen, then Cohen forcing is I^+-preserving, and random forcing is not Borel I^+-preserving.

Note that being Borel I^+-preserving is stronger than just "$\Vdash_P V \cap \omega^\omega \notin I$". For example, set $X := \{x \in \omega^\omega : x(0) = 0\}$ and $Y := \omega^\omega \setminus X$. Let Q be the forcing that adds a real $\underset{\sim}{\eta}$ such that $\underset{\sim}{\eta}$ is random if $\underset{\sim}{\eta} \in X$ and $\underset{\sim}{\eta}$ is Cohen otherwise. Clearly, Q is Suslin ccc. $A \in I$ iff ($A \cap X$ is null and $A \cap Y$ is meager). So if P is random forcing, then $\Vdash_P (\omega^{\omega V} \notin I \;\&\; Y^V \in I)$. Note that in this case a Q-generic real η^* over M will still be generic after forcing with P if $\eta^* \in X$, but not if $\eta^* \in Y$.

However, if P is homogeneous in a certain way with respect to Q, then Borel I^+-preserving and "$\Vdash_P V \cap \omega^\omega \notin I$" are equivalent (see [13] or [9, 3.2] for more details).

Also, Borel I^+-preserving and I^+-preserving are generally not equivalent, not even if P is ccc. The standard example is the following: Let Q be $\mathbb{C}$ (i.e. Cohen forcing, so I is the ideal of meager sets). We will construct a forcing extension V' of V and a ccc forcing $P \in V'$ such that P is Borel I^+-preserving but not I^+-preserving (in V'):

Let $\mathbb{C}_{\omega_1}$ be the forcing adding $\aleph_1$ many Cohen reals $(c_i)_{i \in \omega_1}$, i.e. $\mathbb{C}_{\omega_1}$ is the set of all finite partial functions from $\omega \times \omega_1$ to 2. Then in any $\mathbb{C}_{\omega_1}$-extension $V[(c_i)_{i\in\omega_1}]$ the Cohen reals $\{c_i \,:\, i \in \omega_1\}$ are a Luzin set[7] and for all non-meager Borel sets A, $A \cap \{c_i \,:\, i \in \omega_1\}$ is uncountable. If r is random over V, and $(c_i)_{i\in\omega_1}$ is $\mathbb{C}_{\omega_1}$-generic over $V[r]$, then $(c_i)_{i\in\omega_1}$ is $\mathbb{C}_{\omega_1}$-generic over V as well. So the ccc forcing $\mathbb{B} * \mathbb{C}_{\omega_1}$ can be factored as $\mathbb{C}_{\omega_1} * \underset{\sim}{P}$, where $\underset{\sim}{P}$ is (a name for a) ccc forcing. Set $V' := V[(c_i)_{i\in\omega_1}]$ and $V'' = V'[G_P] = V[r][(c_i)_{i\in\omega_1}]$. Then in V', $P = \underset{\sim}{P}[(c_i)_{i\in\omega_1}]$ is ccc and Borel I^+-preserving, $\omega^\omega \cap V \notin I$, but $P \Vdash \omega^\omega \cap V \in I$.

Definition 4.2.

- For $p \in P^M$, η^* is called absolutely $(Q, \underset{\sim}{\eta})$-generic with respect to p ($\eta^* \in \mathrm{Gen}^{\mathrm{abs}}(M, p)$), if there is an M-generic $p' \leq p$ forcing that $\eta^* \in \mathrm{Gen}(M[G])$.
- P preserves generics for M if for all $p \in P^M$, $\mathrm{Gen}(M) = \mathrm{Gen}^{\mathrm{abs}}(M, p)$. (I.e. every M-generic real could still be $M[G]$-generic in an extension.)

Note that $\mathrm{Gen}^{\mathrm{abs}}(M, p) \subseteq \mathrm{Gen}(M)$ by 2.5 (or 3.9).

Lemma 4.3. If P preserves generics for (the transitive collapse of) unboundedly many countable $N \prec H(\chi)$, then P is I^+-preserving.

Here, unboundedly many means that for all countable $X \subset \omega^\omega$ there is an $N \prec H(\chi)$ countable containing X and P with the required property.

Remark: The lemma still holds if Q is any ccc forcing (i.e. not Suslin ccc. Then N is not collapsed but used directly as in usual proper forcing theory).

Proof. Assume $p \Vdash_P X \subseteq \underset{\sim}{A}[G_P] \in I$, i.e. $p \Vdash_P \Vdash_Q \underset{\sim}{\eta} \notin \underset{\sim}{A}[G_P]^{V[G_P][G_Q]}$. Let $N \prec H(\chi)$ contain $P, X, \underset{\sim}{A}, Q, p$. Let M be the collapse of N and $\underset{\sim}{\eta}^* \in \mathrm{Gen}(M)$, $p' \leq p$ M-generic such that $p' \Vdash \eta^* \in \mathrm{Gen}(M[G_P])$. Let G be V-generic, $p' \in G$.

Then $V[G] \vDash M[G_P][G_Q] \vDash \eta^* \notin A \supseteq X$, so $V \vDash \eta^* \notin X$. Therefore $\mathrm{Gen}(M) \cap X = \emptyset$. $\mathrm{Gen}(M)$ is of measure 1, therefore $V \vDash X \in I$. □

Theorem 4.4. Assume that P is transitive nep (with respect to a strongly normal ZFC*) and Borel I^+-preserving in V and every forcing extension of V. Then P preserves generics (for unboundedly many candidates) and therefore P is I^+-preserving.

We will start with showing that for all candidates M and $p \in P^M$, $\mathrm{Gen}^{\mathrm{abs}}(M, p)$ is nonempty:

Lemma 4.5. If P is Borel I^+-preserving, $A \in I^+_{\mathrm{BC}}$, M a candidate and $p \in P^M$, then $\mathrm{Gen}^{\mathrm{abs}}(M, p) \cap A^V \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. Let G be P-generic over M and V and contain p. In $V[G]$, $\mathrm{Gen}(M[G])$ is of measure 1, and A^V is positive (since P is Borel I^+-preserving). So there is an $\eta^* \in \mathrm{Gen}(M[G]) \cap A^V$. Let $p' \leq p$ force all this (in particular "G is P-generic over M", so p' is M-generic). Then p' witnesses that $\eta^* \in \mathrm{Gen}^{\mathrm{abs}}(M, p)$. □

Before we proceed, we take a look once more at strongly normal theories, to make sure that the models we will be using in the proof really are ZFC*-candidates. Intuitively, the reader can think of ZFC models instead of ZFC* (formally that would require a few inaccessibles)

---

[7] C is a Luzin set if C is uncountable and the intersection of C with any meager set is countable.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
M \arrow[rr, "R_1"] \arrow[dr, dashed, "Q"] & & M[G_{R_1}] =: M_1 \arrow[dr, "R'", "\tilde{G}_2"'] & \\
& M[\eta^{\otimes}] \arrow[ur, dashed, "R_1/Q", "\tilde{G}_1"'] \arrow[rr, dashed, "R_2", "\tilde{G}_1 * \tilde{G}_2"'] & & M[\eta^{\otimes}][G_{R_2}] = M_2
\end{tikzcd}$$

T 1. The models used in the proof of 4.6

and elementary submodels of the universe instead of $H(\chi)$ (that would be more complicated to justify formally).

ZFC* is strongly normal, so for any forcing notion R, χ' regular and large, $1_R \Vdash H(\chi')^{V[G]} \models$ ZFC*. For $p \in R \subseteq H(\chi)$, $\chi' \gg \chi$ regular, $\underset{\sim}{\tau} \in H(\chi')$, the following are equivalent: $H(\chi') \models$ "$p \Vdash_R \varphi(\underset{\sim}{\tau})$" and $p \Vdash_R (H(\chi')^{V[G]} \models \varphi(\underset{\sim}{\tau}))$. So in $H(\chi')$ the following holds: For all small forcings R, $1_R \Vdash_R$ ZFC*.

"P is Borel I^+-preserving" is absolute between V and $H(\chi)$ for $\chi > 2^{\aleph_0}$ regular, since for every $A \in I^+_{\mathrm{BC}} \subset H(\chi)$, $p \Vdash_P A^V \in I$ iff $p \Vdash_P H(\chi)^{V[G_P]} \models A^V \in I$ iff $H(\chi) \models p \Vdash_P A^V \in I$. Also, "$P$ is transitive nep" is absolute: every countable transitive candidate M and every $p \in P$ is in $H(\chi)$, and $p \Vdash_P (G_P \cap P^M$ is M-generic) is absolute by the same argument. In the same way we see the following: If $R \in H(\chi)$, $\chi \ll \chi'$, then "$\Vdash_R$ P is transitive nep and Borel I^+-preserving" is absolute between V and $H(\chi')$, and therefore true in $H(\chi')$ according to our assumption.

So every forcing extension M' (by a small forcing) of $H(\chi')$ (or a transitive collapse of an elementary submodel of $H(\chi')$) as well as $H(\chi)^{M'}$ (for χ large with respect to the forcing) will satisfy ZFC* and think that P is transitive nep and Borel I^+-preserving.

Now we can proceed with the proof of the theorem: Fix $\chi_1 \ll \chi_2 \ll \chi_3$ regular such that $H(\chi_i) \models$ ZFC*. Let $N \prec H(\chi_3)$ contain P, χ_1, χ_2. Clearly there are unboundedly many such N. Let M be the transitive collapse of N. We want to show that P preserves generics for M.

In M, let $H_1 := H(\chi_1) \models$ ZFC*. Let R_i (in M) be the collapse of $H(\chi_i)$ to ω. (I.e. R_i consists of finite functions from ω to $H(\chi_i)$.) Let $\eta^* \in \mathrm{Gen}(M)$, $p_0 \in P^M$. We have to show that $\eta^* \in \mathrm{Gen}^{\mathrm{abs}}(M, p_0)$. Let $G_Q \in V$ be an M-generic filter such that $\underset{\sim}{\eta}[G_Q] = \eta^*$, and let $G_R \in V$ be R_2-generic over $M[G_Q]$, $M' = M[G_Q][G_R]$.

Lemma 4.6. $M' \models$ "H_1 is a ZFC*-candidate, $\eta^* \in \mathrm{Gen}^{\mathrm{abs}}(H_1, p_0)$".

If this is correct, then theorem 4.4 follows: Assume $M' \models$ "$p' \leq p_0$ H_1-generic, $p' \Vdash \eta^* \in \mathrm{Gen}(H_1[G_P])$". M' is a ZFC*-candidate, so we can find a $p'' \leq p'$ be M'-generic. Then p'' is H_1 generic and therefore M generic as well (since $\mathfrak{P}(P) \cap M = \mathfrak{P}(P) \cap H_1$), and $p'' \Vdash \eta^* \in \mathrm{Gen}(M[G_P])$.

Proof of lemma 4.6. It is clear that H_1 is a ZFC*-candidate in M'. Assume towards a contradiction, that $M' \models$ "$\eta^* \notin \mathrm{Gen}^{\mathrm{abs}}(H_1, p_0)$". Then this is forced by some $q \in G_Q$ and $r \in R_2$, but since R_2 is homogeneous, without loss of generality $r = 1$, i.e.

$$(*) \qquad M \models \text{“}q \Vdash_Q \Vdash_{R_2} \eta^* \notin \mathrm{Gen}^{\mathrm{abs}}(H_1, p_0)\text{”}.$$

Now we are going to construct the models of table 1: First, choose a $G_{R_1} \in V$ which is R_1-generic over M, and let $M_1 = M[G_{R_1}]$. In M_1, pick $\eta^{\otimes} \in \mathrm{Gen}^{\mathrm{abs}}(H_1, p_0) \cap B^M_q$. (We can do that by lemma 4.5, since we know that P is Borel I^+-preserving in M_1). Since $\mathrm{Gen}^{\mathrm{abs}} \subseteq \mathrm{Gen}$, $M_1 \vDash$ "$\exists\, G^{\otimes}_Q$ Q-generic over H_1 such that $q \in G^{\otimes}_Q, \underset{\sim}{\eta}[G^{\otimes}_Q] = \eta^{\otimes}$". This $G^{\otimes}_Q$ clearly is M-generic as well (since $M \cap \mathfrak{P}(Q) = H_1 \cap \mathfrak{P}(Q)$), so we can factorize R_1 as $R_1 = Q * R_1/Q$ such that $G_{R_1} = G^{\otimes}_Q * \tilde{G}_1$.

Now we look at the forcing $R_2 = R_2^M$ in $M[\eta^{\otimes}] = M[G^{\otimes}_Q]$. R_2 forces that R_1 is countable and therefore equivalent to Cohen forcing. R_1/Q is a subforcing of R_1. Also, R_2 adds a Cohen real. So R_2 can be factorized as $R_2 = (R_1/Q) * R'$, where $R' = (R_2/(R_1/Q))$. We already have $\tilde{G}_1$, a (R_1/Q)-generic filter over $M[G^{\otimes}_Q]$, now choose $\tilde{G}_2 \in V$ R'-generic over M_1, and let $G_{R_2} = \tilde{G}_1 * \tilde{G}_2$ So $G_{R_2} \in V$ is R_2-generic over $M[G^{\otimes}_Q]$, $M_2 := M[\eta^{\otimes}][G_{R_2}]$.

Let H_2 be $H(\chi_2)^{M_1}$. $H_2 \vDash \mathrm{ZFC}^*$. Also, $H_2 \vDash$ "$p_1 \leq p_0$ is H_1-generic, $p_1 \Vdash \eta^{\otimes} \in \mathrm{Gen}(H_1[G_P])$" (since this is absolute between the universe M_1 and $H_2 = H(\chi_2)^{M_1}$). In M_2, H_2 is a ZFC^*-candidate. Let in M_2, $p_2 \leq p_1$ be H_2-generic. Then (in M_2), p_2 witnesses that $\eta^* \in \mathrm{Gen}^{\mathrm{abs}}(H_1, p_0)$, a contradiction to $(*)$. □

R

[1] Joan Bagaria and Roger Bosch. Projective forcing. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, (86):237–266, 1997.

[2] Tomek Bartoszynski and Haim Judah. *Set Theory: On the Structure of the Real Line*. A K Peters, Wellesley, MA, 1995.

[3] James E. Baumgartner. Iterated forcing. In *Surveys in set theory*, volume 87 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.*, pages 1–59. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge-New York, 1983. Proceedings of Symp. in Set Theory, Cambridge, August 1978; ed. Mathias, A.R.D.

[4] Martin Goldstern. Tools for Your Forcing Construction. In Haim Judah, editor, *Set Theory of The Reals*, volume 6 of *Israel Mathematical Conference Proceedings*, pages 305–360. American Mathematical Society, 1993.

[5] Martin Goldstern and Haim Judah. Iteration of Souslin Forcing, Projective Measurability and the Borel Conjecture. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 78:335–362, 1992.

[6] Jaime Ihoda (Haim Judah) and Saharon Shelah. Souslin forcing. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 53:1188–1207, 1988.

[7] Haim Judah and Saharon Shelah. The Kunen-Miller chart (Lebesgue measure, the Baire property, Laver reals and preservation theorems for forcing). *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 55:909–927, 1990.

[8] Jerome H. Keisler. Logic with the quantifier "there exist uncountably many". *Annals of Mathematical Logic*, 1:1–93, 1970.

[9] Jakob Kellner and Saharon Shelah. Preserving Preservation. *JSL*, accepted. math.LO/0405081.

[10] Janusz Pawlikowski. Laver's forcing and outer measure. In Tomek Bartoszyński and Marion Scheepers, editors, *Proceedings of BEST Conferences 1991–1994*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, 1995.

[11] Andrzej Roslanowski and Saharon Shelah. Norms on possibilities I: forcing with trees and creatures. *Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society*, 141(671):xii + 167, 1999. math.LO/9807172.

[12] Saharon Shelah. *Proper and improper forcing*. Perspectives in Mathematical Logic. Springer, 1998.

[13] Saharon Shelah. Properness Without Elementaricity. *Journal of Applied Analysis*, 10, 2004. math.LO/9712283.

[14] Roman Sikorski. *Boolean Algebras*. Springer Verlag, 1964.

I ¨ D M G , T U ¨ W , 1050 W , A

E-mail address: `kellner@fsmat.at`

URL: `http://www.logic.univie.ac.at/~kellner`